



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/683,630	10/10/2003	Jeffery R. Parker	GLOLP0113USA	1198
23908	7590	02/07/2006	EXAMINER	
RENNER OTTO BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP 1621 EUCLID AVENUE NINETEENTH FLOOR CLEVELAND, OH 44115			VARGOT, MATHIEU D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1732	

DATE MAILED: 02/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/683,630	Applicant(s) PARKER ET AL.	
	Examiner Mathieu D. Vargot	Art Unit 1732	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11 and 20-25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 12-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

1.Applicant's election of Species A, claims 1-10 and 12-19 in the reply filed on January 20, 2006 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

It is noted that the original restriction grouped claim 25 with Group A. However, upon closer inspection, this claim should have been with Species C, which applicant did not elect. Hence, claim 25 will stand with non-elected claims 12 and 20-24.

2.The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 12, 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Caferro (see col. 2, lines 45-67; col. 3, lines 3-10; 14a and 14b in Fig. 11).

The applied reference discloses the instant method of making a transreflector (ie, optical article with portions which transmit and portions that reflect light) by thermoforming a sheet to make a lighting louver, wherein a reflective coating is applied to certain portions of the sheet either before or after it is thermoformed to make angled reflective portions (14a) and other angled (14b—angled at least with respect to portions 14a) non-coated light transmissive surfaces. In claim 12, the language “to transmit light from a backlight” is inherent in the operation of the louver. Also, the coating itself constitutes a “separate film” as set forth in instant claim 15 and it is deposited using

various deposition techniques which would qualify as "line of site" as set forth in instant claim 13. See column 3, lines 3-9.

3.The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-10, 14 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Caferro in view of Japanese Patent 2000-173324.

Caferro discloses the basic claimed method of forming a transreflector lacking essentially the aspect of texturing the light transmissive surfaces as set forth in instant claims 2-6, 10 and 16-18, varying the optical shapes which constitute the texture as set forth in instant claims 7-9 and applying an antireflection coating to the other areas. Concerning the texturing and formation of optical shapes on the light transmissive areas, Japanese -324 discloses a lighting louver device wherein the light passes through a light distribution plate (20) which is textured with optical shapes 20a to diffuse the outgoing light. It certainly would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of the primary reference by providing optical shapes on the light transmissive surface of the sheet as generally taught by Japanese -324 to diffuse and "soften" the incoming light. Varying the shapes via changing size, density and orientation of the shapes would have been an obvious expedient in the combination dependent on the exact optical effect desired for the room. Antireflection coatings are conventionally applied when no reflection is desired and this would have been an

Art Unit: 1732


obvious feature in the process of the primary reference to ensure that the desired light gets transmitted. Note that Caferro (col. 3, lines 3-9) teaches applying the reflective portion using painting, vacuum metallization or any other known coating or plating process. This would have rendered the hot stamping of instant claim 14 as obvious, since such is a well known method of coating a surface.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mathieu D. Vargot whose telephone number is 571 272-1211. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 9 to 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Colaianni, can be reached on 571 272-1196. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M. Vargot
February 2, 2006


Mathieu D. Vargot
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1732
2/2/06